DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 478 805 HE 036 035

AUTHOR	MacFarland, Thomas W.
TITLE	Faculty at Nova Southeastern University Judge the President's Faculty Scholarship Awards: Fall Term 2001.
INSTITUTION	Nova Southeastern Univ., Ft. Lauderdale, FL. Research and Planning.
REPORT NO	NSU-RP-01-18
PUB DATE	2001-12-00
NOTE	21p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Awards; *College Faculty; *Financial Support; Grants; Higher Education; Incentives; *Recognition (Achievement); Teacher Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Nova Southeastern University FL

ABSTRACT

Nova Southeastern University has put into place a President's Faculty Scholarship Award Program, which was designed to bring recognition and funding to the University's full-time faculty as they attempt to secure resources in support of research activity. The program was evaluated as viewed by the University's fall term 2001 full-time faculty. Surveys were distributed to all 563 full-time faculty, and responses were returned by 46 faculty members, a response rate of 8.2%. The low response rate means that there is concern that the responding sample may not be representative of the population. Approximately 25% of the respondents had previously submitted a proposal for competition in the President's Faculty Scholarship Award Program, and about the same percentage had submitted proposals to external funding agencies or organizations within the past year. Responses were generally favorable, and 75% of the statements received a modal rating of "strongly agree" or "agree." Only two statements received a modal rating of less than 3. Responses show that respondents want recognition for their research activities, and that the program is one avenue for such recognition. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 478 805

FACULTY AT NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY JUDGE THE PRESIDENT'S FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS: FALL TERM 2001

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T. MacFarland
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Thomas W. MacFarland

Senior Research Associate

Nova Southeastern University
Research and Planning

Report 01-18

December 2001

HE036035

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FACULTY AT NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY JUDGE THE PRESIDENT'S FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS: FALL TERM 2001

Thomas W. MacFarland **Senior Research Associate**
Report 01-18 **December 2001**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

For the last two years, Nova Southeastern University has put into place a President's Faculty Scholarship Award Program, which was designed to bring recognition and funding to the University's full-time faculty as they attempt to secure resources in support of research activities. The program is proactive in terms of providing impetus and direction toward research activities and in turn the program receives a considerable level of attention by the University's administration as a means of faculty support.

The purpose of this report is to offer an assessment of the President's Faculty Scholarship Award Program, as viewed by the University's Fall Term 2001 full-time faculty. The population for this study was generated by a query (September 2001) from the Office of Grants and Contracts to the Office of Human Resources, asking for a list (printed on mailing labels) of all full-time faculty at Nova Southeastern University during Fall Term 2001 (N = 563).

Surveys were distributed by the Office of Grants and Contracts and returned to the Office of Research and Planning, with a suggested survey return deadline of November 2, 2001. In an effort to be broadly inclusive, it was decided that the survey should be distributed to all full-time faculty instead of the more exclusive notion to query prior applicants only. Surveys were returned by 46 participants from a population of 563 members, resulting in a survey return of 8.2 percent. It should be noted that the response rate was clearly less than desired and there is always a concern that the responding sample may not be representative of the population.

Approximately 25 percent of all respondents had previously submitted a proposal for competition in the President's Faculty Scholarship Award Program. Further, approximately 25 percent of all respondents had submitted proposals to external funding agencies/organizations within the past year.

Regarding responses to the Likert-type statements included on the survey, respondents were generally favorable to the President's Faculty Scholarship Award Program, as evidenced by the observation that 75 percent of all statements (18 of 24) received a modal rating of either 5 (Strongly Agree) or 4 (Agree). Only two statements received a modal rating of less than 3:

Mode = 1 The feedback I received on my proposal was helpful.

Mode = 2 The PFSA ceremony is an important way to recognize faculty for their research and scholarship endeavors.

When viewing survey results, it is perhaps especially important to highlight how the statement *I would like to see NSU develop other ways to recognize faculty for their research and scholarship endeavors* received the highest rating of all statements, with a mean rating of 4.69 (SD = 0.58). Faculty clearly want recognition for their research activities and the President's Faculty Scholarship Award Program is certainly one avenue for leadership in this area.

Along with any outcomes that may be put into place because of specific survey results, this report is also useful as another example of the University's commitment to the widespread nature of a formal Institutional Effectiveness process, specifically in terms of how research is viewed as an essential activity by the University's faculty. It is cautioned that in 2004, as the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools replaces the existing *Criteria for Accreditation* (1998) with the *Principles of Accreditation* (2001), attention to the Institutional Effectiveness process will only increase in importance. This formal assessment process is extensive and it is an inherent part of how the University examines the means by which goals are met. This report, in part, contributes to that process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
BACKGROUND	1
Introduction	1
Purpose of This Report	1
METHODOLOGY	2
Survey Development	2
Population and Sample	2
RESULTS	3
SUMMARY	3
REFERENCES	5
APPENDIX: Tables 1 to 3 and Survey	6

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Academic Center Affiliation: Population and Survey Respondents	6
2	Responses to Survey Statements on Prior Application for Funded Research	8
3	Responses to Survey Statements on the President's Faculty Scholarship Awards (PFSA)	9

BACKGROUND

Introduction

Nova Southeastern University was chartered in 1964 and instruction at the University was first offered in 1967 to a charter class of 17 doctoral students (*Nova Southeastern University Fact Book 2001*; 2001, p. 9). By planning for both campus-based programs and educational opportunities available through distance education, the University has experienced considerable growth over the last 35 years and based on Fall Term 2000 enrollment statistics maintained by the National Center for Education Statistics (http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cool/), the University is the 12th largest private not-for-profit institution of higher education in the United States. Based on the most current data available, the University has a Fall Term 2001 enrollment of 19,065 students (*IPEDS Fall 2001 Enrollment Survey*; 2001).

To meet the needs of its many constituencies, the University has developed a Mission Statement that addresses the contemporary needs of students, faculty and staff, and community members throughout South Florida, other areas in Florida, and other states and international locations served through distance education:

> Nova Southeastern University is a dynamic, not-for-profit independent institution dedicated to providing high-quality educational programs of distinction from preschool through the professional and doctoral levels, as well as service to the community. Nova Southeastern University prepares students for lifelong learning and leadership roles in business and the professions. It offers academic programs at times convenient to students, employing innovative delivery systems and rich learning resources on campus and at distant sites. The university fosters inquiry, research, and creative professional activity, by uniting faculty and students in acquiring and applying knowledge in clinical, community, and professional settings (*Nova Southeastern University Fact Book 2001*; 2001, p. iv).

Purpose of This Report

As one of many means used to address the University's Mission Statement and specifically the issue on how the University "fosters inquiry, research, and creative professional activity," the University initiated a President's Faculty Scholarship Award Program for the 2000-2001 academic year. The award program was repeated during the 2001-2002 academic year and it is now an annual program sponsored by the University.

The purpose of this report is to offer an assessment of the President's Faculty Scholarship Award Program, as viewed by the University's Fall Term 2001 full-time faculty. Detailed information on this program is available at <http://www.nova.edu/cwis/vpaa/>.

METHODOLOGY

Survey Development

The University's Office of Research and Planning was approached in early-September 2001 by the Assistant to the President for Academic Affairs and the Director of the Office of Grants and Contracts, requesting assistance with survey development and methodology regarding an assessment of the President's Faculty Scholarship Award Program. From this initial request, an iterative process was used to prepare a draft survey that focused on the purpose of this report. The draft survey was further reviewed and it was put into final form by October 2001. A copy of the survey is appended to this report.

Population and Sample

The population for this study was generated by a query (September 2001) from the Office of Grants and Contracts to the Office of Human Resources, asking for a list (printed on mailing labels) of all full-time faculty at Nova Southeastern University during Fall Term 2001 (N = 563). It should be noted that the University reported 479 Fall Term 2000 full-time faculty (*Nova Southeastern University Fact Book 2001*; 2001, p. 74). This one-year increase (N = 84 or 17.5 percent) is rather large and it may be helpful in the future to further examine this variance.

As the labels were printed, some faculty members were identified by department code. These codes were compared against a master list and transformed into *by center* affiliation. There were two members of the population who are employees of the University, but their department is not affiliated with an academic center.

Surveys were distributed by the Office of Grants and Contracts and returned to the Office of Research and Planning, with a suggested survey return deadline of November 2, 2001. Surveys were returned by 46 participants from a population of 563 members, resulting in a survey return of 8.2 percent (Table 1). It should be noted that the response rate was clearly less than desired and there is always a concern that the responding sample may not be representative of the population. In an effort to be broadly inclusive, it was decided that the survey should be distributed to all full-time faculty instead of the more exclusive notion to query prior applicants only.

RESULTS

A set of tables (Table 2 and Table 3) provide descriptive statistics on survey results, providing breakout information by:

Table 2 Prior Application for Funded Research

Table 3 General Survey Statements

As evidenced in Table 2, approximately 25 percent of all respondents had previously submitted a proposal for competition in the President's Faculty Scholarship Award Program. Further, approximately 25 percent of all respondents had submitted proposals to external funding agencies/organizations within the past year.

Responses to the Likert-type statements (the scale ranged from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) are summarized in Table 3. Generally, respondents were favorable to the President's Faculty Scholarship Award Program, as evidenced by the observation that 75 percent of all statements (18 of 24) received a modal rating of either 5 (Strongly Agree) or 4 (Agree). It may be helpful, however, to give some level of attention to the two statements that received noticeably low modal ratings:

The feedback I received on my proposal was helpful	N	11	Mode	1	Mean	2.45
			Median	2	SD	1.44
The PFSA ceremony is an important way to recognize faculty for their research and scholarship endeavors	N	30	Mode	2	Mean	3.30
			Median	3	SD	1.32

Although survey results were generally positive, it cannot be ignored that the survey return rate was less than 10 percent and it is unknown if results from this survey process are representative of the population.

SUMMARY

The President's Faculty Scholarship Award Program has been designed to bring recognition and funding to the University's full-time faculty as they attempt to secure resources in support of

research activities. The program is proactive in terms of providing impetus and direction toward research activities and in turn the program receives a considerable level of attention by the University's administration as a means of faculty support.

This report provided evidence that respondents are generally positive toward the program. Only two statements received a modal rating of less than 3 and only one statement received a mean rating of less than 3.0.

When viewing survey results, it is perhaps especially important to highlight how the statement *I would like to see NSU develop other ways to recognize faculty for their research and scholarship endeavors* received the highest rating of all statements, with a mean rating of 4.69 (SD = 0.58). Faculty clearly want recognition for their research activities and the President's Faculty Scholarship Award Program is certainly one avenue for leadership in this area.

When viewing the results of this report, it must be recalled that survey return percentage was less than 10 percent. As the survey was developed and decisions were made about the composition of the invited sample, it was judged appropriate to distribute the survey to all full-time faculty instead of the less inclusive list of prior applicants. This broadly inclusive distribution list may have contributed to a diminished survey return percentage, but the composition of the invited sample was judged desirable in that all faculty have now received an additional communication about the program.

Along with any outcomes that may be put into place because of specific survey results, this report is also useful as another example of the University's commitment to the widespread nature of a formal Institutional Effectiveness process, specifically in terms of how research is viewed as an essential activity by the University's faculty. It is cautioned that in 2004, as the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools replaces the existing *Criteria for Accreditation* (1998) with the *Principles of Accreditation* (2001), attention to the Institutional Effectiveness process will only increase in importance:

> Comprehensive Standard 16 Institutional Effectiveness
>
> The institution identifies expected outcomes for its educational programs and its administrative and educational support services; assesses whether it achieves these outcomes; and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of those results (*Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement - A Proposal* (2001, p. 14).

This formal assessment process is extensive and it is an inherent part of how the University examines the means by which goals are met. This report, in part, contributes to that process.

REFERENCES

Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (1998). *Criteria for Accreditation*. Decatur, Georgia.

Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (December 2001). *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement - A Proposal*. Decatur, Georgia.

IPEDS Fall 2001 Enrollment Survey. (December 7, 2001).

National Center for Education Statistics. *IPEDS College Opportunities On-Line*. <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cool/>. Accessed December 13, 2001.

Nova Southeastern University Fact Book. (2001). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. (Research and Planning Report 01-01).

Nova Southeastern University. *Office of Academic Affairs*. <http://www.nova.edu/cwis/vpaa/>. Accessed December 13, 2001.

Table 1

Academic Center Affiliation: Population and Survey Respondents

Affiliation	Population		Respondents	
	N	% Total	N	% Total
Center for Psychological Studies	38[1]	6.7	2	4.3
Farquhar Center for Undergraduate Studies	69	12.3	9	19.6
Fischler Graduate School of Education and Human Services	69	12.3	6	13.0
Law Center	53	9.4	1	2.2
Oceanographic Center	13	2.3	2	4.3
Huizenga Graduate School of Business and Entrepreneurship	26	4.6	2	4.3
Graduate School of Computer and Information Sciences	18	3.2	2	4.3
Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences	17	3.0	3	6.5
Health Professions Division (HPD)				
College of Allied Health	45	8.0	4	8.7
College of Dental Medicine	77	13.7	4	8.7

[1] The population for this study was generated by a query (September 2001) from the Office of Grants and Contracts to the Office of Human Resources, asking for a list (printed on mailing labels) of all full-time faculty at Nova Southeastern University during Fall Term 2001 (N = 563). It should be noted that the University reported 479 Fall Term 2000 full-time faculty (*Nova Southeastern University Fact Book 2001*; 2001, p. 74). This one-year increase (N = 84 or 17.5 percent) is rather large and it may be helpful to further examine this variance. As the labels were printed, some faculty members were identified by department code. These codes were compared against a master list and transformed into *by center* affiliation. There were two members of the population who are employees of the University, but their department is not affiliated with an academic center.

Affiliation	Population		Respondents	
	N	% Total	N	% Total
College of Medical Sciences	26	4.6	3	6.5
College of Optometry	40	7.1	5	10.9
College of Osteopathic Medicine	17	3.0	1	2.2
College of Pharmacy	48	8.5	1	2.2
HPD Unidentified College	5	0.9	0	0.0
HPD Subtotal	258	45.8	18	39.1
Unaffiliated Academic Center	2	0.4	1	2.2
TOTAL	563	100.0	46	100.0

Table 2

Responses to Survey Statements on Prior Application for Funded Research

Statement	Yes		No		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Have you submitted a proposal to the PFSA competition?	11	23.9	34	73.9	1	2.2
Was your proposal funded?	5	10.9	10	21.7	31	67.4
Have you submitted any proposals to external funding agencies/organizations within the past year?	13	28.3	30	65.2	3	6.5

Table 3

Responses to Survey Statements on the President's Faculty Scholarship Awards (PFSA)

Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
The PFSA provides a demonstrated commitment from the university to faculty scholarship and research	39	5[2]	4	3.67	1.30
The PFSA are an effective means to encourage faculty research and scholarship	39	5	4	3.54	1.37
The PFSA provide incentive to seek additional funded research and scholarship from external sources	37	3	4	3.46	1.24
The PFSA information available at the academic affairs web site is helpful in explaining the program	32	4	4	3.88	0.91
The PFSA information available at the academic affairs web site is helpful in completing the application process	30	4	4	3.87	0.94
The pre-award technical assistance workshop answered all of my questions about the PFSA process	11	4	4	3.73	1.19

[2] The following was used for responses to Likert-type statements:

Rating Key			
5	Strongly Agree	2	Disagree
4	Agree	1	Strongly Disagree
3	Neutral, Neither Agree Nor Disagree	NA	Not Applicable

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
The PFSA guidelines are understandable	30	4	4	3.87	0.97
The PFSA application is easy to complete	26	4	4	3.92	0.80
The funding priorities for the PFSA are clearly stated	29	4	4	3.52	1.06
The funding priorities for the PFSA are fair to a broad range of scholarship	32	4	4	3.38	1.16
The activities eligible for funding through the PFSA are fair to a Broad range of scholarship	31	3	3	3.45	1.06
The activities which are unallowable for funding through the PFSA are fair	31	3	3	3.26	1.21
The length of the proposal (i.e., 5 double space pages of 12 pt font) is adequate to present a proposal narrative	34	4	4	3.94	0.92
The required components of the proposal narrative are adequate to present my proposal narrative in a comprehensive manner	31	4	4	3.74	1.03
The categories used in the Reviewer Proposal Rating Form are clearly stated	22	4	4	3.86	0.94
The categories used in the Reviewer Proposal Ratings are appropriate for a broad range of proposals	22	3	3	3.41	1.14
The feedback I received on my proposal was helpful	11	1	2	2.45	1.44
The PFSA ceremony is an important way to recognize faculty for their research and scholarship endeavors	30	2	3	3.30	1.32

Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
The PFSA ceremony is an effective way to recognize faculty for their research and scholarship endeavors	30	5	3	3.30	1.37
I would like to see NSU develop other ways to recognize faculty for their research and scholarship endeavors	36	5	4	4.69	0.58
The matching funds formula for the PFSA is a fair system	32	4	4	3.41	1.32
The components of the deans' letter of support are understandable	22	3	4	3.41	1.18
The components of the deans' letter of support adequately cover the important considerations for the conduct of the projects in my academic unit	21	4	4	3.43	1.21
The final progress report and any other follow-up reports related to the PFSA awards are important information for the university community	26	4	4	4.08	0.98

NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
PRESIDENT'S FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS SURVEY
OCTOBER 2001

Purpose Statement: The purpose of this survey is to elicit information from President's Faculty Scholarship Awards (PFSA) applicants and awardees, as well as other faculty, about the award program and process.

1. Please check your academic center.

- ☐ Center for Psychological Studies
- ☐ Farquhar Center for Undergraduate Studies
- ☐ Family Center
- ☐ Fischler Graduate School of Education and Human Services
- ☐ Law Center
- ☐ Oceanographic Center
- ☐ Huizenga Graduate School of Business and Entrepreneurship
- ☐ Graduate School of Computer and Information Sciences
- ☐ Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences
- ☐ Health Professions Division
  - ☐ College of Allied Health
  - ☐ College of Dental Medicine
  - ☐ College of Medical Sciences
  - ☐ College of Optometry
  - ☐ College of Osteopathic Medicine
  - ☐ College of Pharmacy
- ☐ University School
- ☐ Other

As Nova Southeastern University matures, a part of its evolving mission is the development of its faculty. One important faculty activity is scholarship. Through the efforts of the university president and its Trustees a quasi-endowment has been established to support faculty scholarship through the President's Faculty Scholarship Awards program. Your assessment of the program and the process is requested, using survey statements prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs and the rating key (selections are Yes or No and 1 to 5 and NA) as a guide.

1. Please check either Yes or No for the following questions.

Have you submitted a proposal to the PFSA competition?	Yes	No
Was your proposal funded?	Yes	No
Have you submitted any proposals to external funding agencies/organizations within the past year?	Yes	No

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. Please check 5 to 1 or NA for the following statements. Use the rating key at the bottom of this page.

The PFSA provides a demonstrated commitment from the university to faculty scholarship and research	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The PFSA are an effective means to encourage faculty research and scholarship	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The PFSA provide incentive to seek additional funded research and scholarship from external sources	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The PFSA information available at the academic affairs web site is helpful in explaining the program	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The PFSA information available at the academic affairs web site is helpful in completing the application process	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The pre-award technical assistance workshop answered all of my questions about the PFSA process	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The PFSA guidelines are understandable	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The PFSA application is easy to complete	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The funding priorities for the PFSA are clearly stated	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The funding priorities for the PFSA are fair to a broad range of scholarship	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The activities eligible for funding through the PFSA are fair to a broad range of scholarship	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The activities which are unallowable for funding through the PFSA are fair	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The length of the proposal (i.e., 5 double space pages of 12 pt font) is adequate to present a proposal narrative	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The required components of the proposal narrative are adequate to present my proposal narrative in a comprehensive manner	5	4	3	2	1	NA

Rating Key

5	Strongly Agree	2	Disagree
4	Agree	1	Strongly Disagree
3	Neutral, Neither Agree Nor Disagree	NA	Not Applicable

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The categories used in the Reviewer Proposal Rating Form are clearly stated	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The categories used in the Reviewer Proposal Ratings are appropriate for a broad range of proposals	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The feedback I received on my proposal was helpful	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The PFSA ceremony is an important way to recognize faculty for their research and scholarship endeavors	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The PFSA ceremony is an effective way to recognize faculty for their research and scholarship endeavors	5	4	3	2	1	NA
I would like to see NSU develop other ways to recognize faculty for their research and scholarship endeavors	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The matching funds formula for the PFSA is a fair system	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The components of the deans' letter of support are understandable	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The components of the deans' letter of support adequately cover the important considerations for the conduct of the projects in my academic unit	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The final progress report and any other follow-up reports related to the PFSA awards are important information for the university community	5	4	3	2	1	NA

General comments and suggestions

Rating Key			
5	Strongly Agree	2	Disagree
4	Agree	1	Strongly Disagree
3	Neutral, Neither Agree Nor Disagree	NA	Not Applicable

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

General comments and suggestions (continued)

Thank You for Your Participation!
Please use either the enclosed envelope or interoffice mail to return this survey to:

Nova Southeastern University
Research and Planning
3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314
Attention: Claire Spann
Surveys should be returned by November 2, 2001.

October 2001

ED 436 535

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Faculty at Nova Southeastern University Judge the President's Faculty Scholarship Awards: Fall Term 2001	
Author(s): Dr. Thomas W. MacFarland	
Corporate Source: Nova Southeastern University	Publication Date: 12-01

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Thomas W. MacFarland	Printed Name/Position/Title: Thomas W. MacFarland; Senior Psy Assoc.
Organization/Address: Nova Southeastern University	Telephone: 954-262-5395 FAX: 954-683-0584
	E-Mail Address: tommac@nsu.nova.edu Date: 5-5-03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
One Dupont Circle NW #630
Washington, DC 20036
fax (202)452-1844

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)